

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,884		07/29/2003	Hardayal Singh Gill	HSJ920030125US1	HSJ920030125US1 5556	
51298	7590	05/06/2005		EXAMINER		
	CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC 1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE				BERNATZ, KEVIN M	
SUITE 390				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL,	MN 551	20	1773			

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/629,884	GILL, HARDAYAL	SINGH				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Kevin M Bernatz	1773					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	lress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 April 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amend condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. Th	ne reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant ust timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in prodition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued xamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final reject	ion.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appea has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because							
(a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendments were not previous required and, hence, would require further consideration and/or search. In addition, the Examiner notes that it is unclear if applicants have explicit support for the negative limitation "only in a diffusion region" since negative limitations require explicit support and a mere absent of other language is not sufficient for a negative limitation. Finally, the langauge "a diffusion component-specific depth profile" also does not appear to be supported by applicants' as-filed disclosure. Applicants are asked to distinctly point out where support for such language is derived from, utilizing only the as-filed disclosure.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants arguments are directed to the unentered amendments.

Kevin M. Bernatz, PhD Primary Examiner